

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough review of the present application. As discussed in detail below, the present claims in the present application include recitations that patently distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references, taken individually or in combination. Based upon the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application and allowance of the pending claims.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application.

Kindly cancel claim 2.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 14, 15 and 16 are currently amended.

Specifically, claims 1, 15 and 16 have been amended to distinguish the claimed invention from the teachings of United States Patent No. 5,966,121, issued to Hubbell et al. (hereinafter, the Hubbell patent). Distinguishing arguments are presented below

Claim 3 has been amended to insure proper dependency and add clarity.

Claims 6, 7, 10 and 14 have been amended to change the verb “contains” to “includes”.

Claim 16 has been amended to overcome Examiner’s objections.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to the language of claim 16. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the order of the program instructions. The Applicant has amended claim 16 to reflect proper sequential ordering of the program instructions.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Hubbell patent. Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are overcome by the following arguments.

Hubbell Does Not Teach or Suggest the Specific User Interface Unit for Editing Object-Based Interactive Multimedia Contents as Claimed in Claim 1

The Hubbell patent discloses an apparatus and method for interfacing with a hypervideo multimedia application when composing and playing same. However, the Hubbell patent fails to teach or suggest an apparatus and a method for authoring multimedia contents with object-based interactivity in accordance with the present invention.

Claim 1 requires a user interfacing unit for providing an interface to thereby edit object-based interactive multimedia contents by using a multimedia information editing and authoring tool. As amended, claim 1 further limits the invention by requiring that the user interfacing unit include interfaces for (a) inserting, deleting each object; (b) editing properties that characterizing each object; (c) editing logical relationships between media objects, (d) editing spatial allocation; (e) editing the time allocation, (f) editing user interactivity for the media objects and (g) displaying information for the media objects being edited. The Hubbell patent does not teach the above mentioned user interfacing unit of the present invention.

The Examiner indicates that Hubbell patent discloses, at column 2, line 65 – column 3, line 35, the user interface with functionality for editing logical, spatial, time and user interactivity for the media objects and for displaying information for objects being edited.

However, in the GUI interface 171 (Figure 5) of the Hubbell patent the video, audio and static images are each considered as an independent object. As described in the Hubbell patent, at column 4 lines 41 to 44, a hypervideo application is composed by associating selected frames of a digital video program segment with particular hypervideo actions, with each of the actions being defined in a data file (a mark video file). Accordingly, it is impossible to edit each segment existing in the video or audio, and to re-edit the edited video, because an edited/authored resulting product is generated as one image and there is no definition on relations between the multimedia objects.

In contrary, the user interface unit of the present invention provides interfaces for performing a variety operations based on the user's requests such as inserting, deleting each object, editing properties of characterizing each object, editing logical relationships between media objects, editing the time allocation, editing spatial allocation, editing user interactivity and showing information for the contents.

As mentioned above, the Hubbell patent does not teach the object-based internal material structure allowing the edited images to be re-edited, e.g., properties of the media objects and relationship between the media objects. In detail, the Hubbell patent fails to teach the user interfacing unit for editing properties of the media object, the logical relationship between the media objects, the spatial allocation for the media object, the time allocation for the media object and the user interactivity for the media object so as to re-edit the edited images.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1. Claims 3-14 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as presented above with respect to Claim 1 by virtue of their dependence from Claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 15, the Examiner asserts that the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, in further consideration of Hubbell, Figures 9-10 and column 4-lines 44-49, and therefore is rejected along the same rationale.

As amended, claim 15 further limits the invention by requiring that method provide, on the user-interface (a) inserting, deleting each object; (b) editing properties that characterizing each object; (c) editing logical relationships between media objects, (d) editing spatial allocation; (e) editing the time allocation, (f) editing user interactivity for the media objects and (g) displaying information for the media objects being edited. As discussed above, the Hubbell patent does not teach the above mentioned functionality on the user interface of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15.

Regarding independent claim 16, the Examiner asserts that the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, in further consideration of Hubbell, Figures 9-10 and column 4-lines 44-49, and therefore is rejected along the same rationale.

As amended, claim 16 further limits the invention by requiring a second program instruction means for providing, on the user-interface (a) inserting, deleting each object; (b) editing properties that characterizing each object; (c) editing logical relationships between media objects, (d) editing spatial allocation; (e) editing the time allocation, (f) editing user interactivity for the media objects and (g) displaying information for the media objects being edited. As discussed above, the Hubbell patent does not teach the above mentioned functionality on the user interface of the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 16.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/

Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: February 15, 2007